

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

CHRISTINE MARIE REEVES,

Plaintiff,

v.

1:21-CV-659
(LEK/DJS)

THE STATE OF NEW YORK, ALBANY COUNTY
FAMILY COURT, and BROOME COUNTY FAMILY
COURT,

Defendants.

APPEARANCES:

OF COUNSEL:

CHRISTINE MARIE REEVES
Plaintiff, *Pro Se*
Delmar, New York 12054

DANIEL J. STEWART
United States Magistrate Judge

REPORT-RECOMMENDATION and ORDER

The Clerk has sent to the Court Plaintiff's *pro se* Complaint. Dkt. No. 1, Compl.
The Court has separately granted Plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis*. In
accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), the Court will *sua sponte* review the sufficiency of
the Complaint.

I. DISCUSSION

A. Legal Standards

Section 1915(e) of Title 28 of the United States Code directs that, when a plaintiff
seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis*, "the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the

U court determines that . . . the action or appeal (i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Thus, it is a court’s responsibility to determine that a plaintiff may properly maintain her complaint before permitting her to proceed further with her action.

L In reviewing a *pro se* complaint, this Court has a duty to show liberality toward *pro se* litigants, see *Nance v. Kelly*, 912 F.2d 605, 606 (2d Cir. 1990), and should exercise “extreme caution . . . in ordering *sua sponte* dismissal of a *pro se* complaint before the adverse party has been served and both parties (but particularly the plaintiff) have had an opportunity to respond.” *Anderson v. Coughlin*, 700 F.2d 37, 41 (2d Cir. 1983) (emphasis in original) (citations omitted). Therefore, a court should not dismiss a complaint if the plaintiff has stated “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (citing *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). Although the S court should construe the factual allegations in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, “the tenet that a court must accept as true all of the allegations contained in a complaint is inapplicable to legal conclusions.” *Id.* “Threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.” *Id.* (citing *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555). “[W]here the well-pleaded facts do not permit the court to infer more than the mere possibility of misconduct, the complaint has alleged –

but it has not ‘show[n]’–‘that the pleader is entitled to relief.’” *Id.* at 679 (quoting FED. R. CIV. P. 8(a)(2)). A pleading that only “tenders naked assertions devoid of further factual enhancement” will not suffice. *Id.* at 678 (further citing *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555, for the proposition that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 “demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation”). Allegations that “are so vague as to fail to give the defendants adequate notice of the claims against them” are subject to dismissal. *Sheehy v. Brown*, 335 Fed. Appx. 102, 104 (2d Cir. 2009).

Furthermore, a court’s initial review of a complaint under § 1915(e) must encompass the applicable standards of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that a pleading must contain:

- (1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court’s jurisdiction . . . ;
- (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief; and
- (3) a demand for the relief sought, which may include relief in the alternative or different types of relief.

FED. R. CIV. P. 8(a). The purpose of Rule 8 “is to give fair notice of the claim being asserted so as to permit the adverse party the opportunity to file a responsive answer [and] prepare an adequate defense.” *Hudson v. Artuz*, 1998 WL 832708, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 30, 1998) (quoting *Powell v. Marine Midland Bank*, 162 F.R.D. 15, 16 (N.D.N.Y. 1995)).

Moreover, Rule 10 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides, in part:

(b) Paragraphs; Separate Statements. A party must state its claims or defenses in numbered paragraphs, each limited as far as practicable to a single set of circumstances. A later pleading may refer by number to a paragraph in an earlier pleading. If doing so would promote clarity, each

claim founded on a separate transaction or occurrence – and each defense other than a denial – must be stated in a separate count or defense.

FED. R. CIV. P. 10(b). The purpose of Rule 10 is to “provide an easy mode of identification for referring to a particular paragraph in a prior pleading[.]” *Sandler v. Capanna*, 1992 WL 392597, at *3 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 17, 1992) (citing 5 C. Wright & A. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure*, § 1323 at 735 (1990)).

A complaint that fails to comply with these Rules “presents far too heavy a burden in terms of defendants’ duty to shape a comprehensive defense and provides no meaningful basis for the Court to assess the sufficiency of [the plaintiff’s] claims,” and may properly be dismissed by the court. *Gonzales v. Wing*, 167 F.R.D. 352, 355 (N.D.N.Y. 1996). “Dismissal, however, is usually reserved for those cases in which the complaint is so confused, ambiguous, vague, or otherwise unintelligible that its true substance, if any, is well disguised.” *Hudson v. Artuz*, 1998 WL 832708, at *2 (internal quotation marks omitted). In those cases in which the court dismisses a *pro se* complaint for failure to comply with these Rules, it should afford the plaintiff leave to amend the complaint to state a claim that is on its face nonfrivolous. *See Simmons v. Abruzzo*, 49 F.3d 83, 86-87 (2d Cir. 1995).

B. Analysis of Plaintiff’s Claims

At the outset, the Court notes that Plaintiff’s Complaint fails to satisfy the basic pleading requirements of Rules 8 and 10 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, making it challenging to assess whether or not she has stated a viable claim for relief. *See generally* Compl. From a purely form perspective, the Complaint fails to provide specific

facts relevant to the claims or to relate them to federal causes of action. This alone would be sufficient basis to dismiss the Complaint upon initial review. *Sheehy v. Brown*, 335 Fed. Appx. at 104. Generally stated, however, the Complaint appears to allege irregularities in court proceedings involving a child custody matter. *See, e.g., Compl.* at pp. 14-16.

Under clearly established law, the current Complaint is barred by the Eleventh Amendment which provides states immunity in federal court. *Woods v. Rondout Valley Cent. Sch. Dist. Bd of Educ.*, 466 F.3d 232, 236 (2d Cir. 2006). The immunity applies both to the State itself and state agencies. *Feingold v. New York*, 366 F.3d 138, 149 (2d Cir. 2004); *McGinty v. New York*, 251 F.3d 84, 95 (2d Cir. 2001) (“The Eleventh Amendment extends immunity not only to a state, but also to entities considered ‘arms of the state.’”). That Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief, in addition to damages, does not affect the analysis since “such claims cannot be brought directly against the state, or a state agency, but only against state officials in their official capacities.” *Olivo v. New York State Dep’t of Corr. & Cmty. Supervision*, 2017 WL 2656199, at *3 (N.D.N.Y. June 20, 2017) (citing *Santiago v. New York State Dep’t of Corr. Serv.*, 945 F.2d 25, 32 (2d Cir. 1991)).

“As a general rule, state governments and their agencies may not be sued in federal court unless they have waived their Eleventh Amendment immunity or there has been a valid abrogation of that immunity by Congress.” *Jackson v. Battaglia*, 63 F.Supp.3d 214, 219-20 (N.D.N.Y. 2014) (citation omitted). “It is well-established that New York has not consented to § 1983 suits in federal court and that § 1983 was not intended to override a

state's sovereign immunity." *Mamot v. Bd. of Regents*, 367 Fed. Appx. 191, 192 (2d Cir. 2010) (internal citations omitted). No other basis for waiver or abrogation is set forth in the Complaint. Plaintiff's claim against New York State is therefore subject to dismissal under the Eleventh Amendment. The same is true of claims against the Albany and Broome County Family Courts. "New York family courts . . . are part of 'the New York State Unified Court System[, which are] unquestionably an arm of the State and is entitled to Eleventh Amendment sovereign immunity.'" *Dodd v. O'Sullivan*, 2020 WL 204253, at *4 (N.D.N.Y. Jan. 14, 2020) (quoting *Gollomp v. Spitzer*, 568 F.3d 355, 368 (2d Cir. 2009)); *see also Ryan v. Cholakakis*, 2014 WL 803776, at *5 (N.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2014) (Rensselaer County Family Court is "entitled to Eleventh Amendment immunity.")

II. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, it is hereby

RECOMMENDED, that Plaintiff's Complaint be **DISMISSED with prejudice**; and it is

ORDERED, that the Clerk of the Court serve a copy of this Report-Recommendation and Order upon the parties to this action.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the parties have fourteen (14)¹ days within which to file written objections to the foregoing report. Such objections shall be filed with the Clerk of the Court. **FAILURE TO OBJECT TO THIS REPORT WITHIN**

¹ If you are proceeding *pro se* and are served with this Order by mail, three additional days will be added to the fourteen-day period, meaning that you have seventeen days from the date the order was mailed to you to serve and file objections. FED. R. CIV. P. 6(d). If the last day of that prescribed period falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, then the deadline is extended until the end of the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday. FED. R. CIV. P. 6(a)(1)(C).

FOURTEEN (14) DAYS WILL PRECLUDE APPELLATE REVIEW. *Roldan v. Racette*, 984 F.2d 85, 89 (2d Cir. 1993) (citing *Small v. Sec’y of Health and Human Servs.*, 892 F.2d 15 (2d Cir. 1989)); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72 & 6(a).

Dated: July 23, 2021
Albany, New York


Daniel J. Stewart
U.S. Magistrate Judge